1 2	Eric W. Schmidt, Bar No. 022682 THE SCHMIDT LAW GROUP 10869 N. Scottsdale Road, Suite 103-155				
3	Scottsdale, Arizona 85254 Telephone: (602) 282-0047 Facsimile: (602) 610-4039				
4	slgarizona@gmail.com				
5	Attorney for Plaintiff				
6					
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
8	DISTRICT OF ARIZONA				
9					
10	Dora Uriarte,)	Case No. 2:23-cv-01465-CDB		
11	Plaintiff,)	JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT REPORT		
12	VS.)			
13	Costco Wholesale Corporation,)			
14	Defendant.)			
15		-/			
16	Plaintiff Dora Uriarte ("Plaintiff") and Defendant Costco Wholesale Corporation				
17	("Costco"), by and through their respective counsel, hereby submit the instant Joint Case				
18	Management Report in accordance with the Court's August 10, 2023 Order setting the Rule				
19	16 Scheduling Conference (Doc. 9).				
20	A. <u>Nature of Case</u>				
21	Plaintiff: On September 20, 2020, Plaintiff Dora Uriarte was an invitee at Defendant				
22	Costco's retail warehouse, when she slipped and fell due to a liquid/food substance on the				
23	floor, causing bodily injuries.				
24	Plaintiff has incurred \$21,077.09 in medical expenses related to bodily injuries caused				
25	by the incident. Plaintiff experienced chronic pain and soreness which impaired her activities				
26	of daily living, and continues to have residual periodic pain and soreness claiming \$54,713.00				
27	in future medical treatment.				
28	Costco: Costco disputes liability, as we	ell a	as the nature and extent of Plaintiff's alleged		

damages.

B. Factual and Legal Disputes Genuinely in Dispute

Plaintiff:

- a. Whether Defendant owed Plaintiff the duty to exercise ordinary care in its ownership, possession, control, maintenance and use of the premises to reduce or eliminate risks of harm created by unreasonably dangerous conditions.
- b. Whether Defendant had notice of the unreasonably dangerous condition prior to Plaintiff slipping and falling by creating the unreasonably dangerous condition.
- c. Whether Defendant had notice of the unreasonably dangerous condition prior to Plaintiff slipping and falling when Defendant's employees knew a liquid substance and food had accumulated on the floor.
- d. Whether Defendant had constructive notice of the unreasonably dangerous condition prior to Plaintiff slipping and falling when Defendant's employees in the exercise of reasonable care should have known that the liquid substance and food was accumulating on the floor.
- e. Whether Defendant breached the duty and obligation to keep the warehouse premises reasonably safe for Plaintiff by failing to maintain the standard of care as defined by Defendant's operating policies and procedures to prevent slip and fall incidents from occurring.
- f. Whether Defendant's mode of operation increased the likelihood that liquid substances and food would accumulate on the floor in areas open to customers/invitees in the warehouse, was a breach of the duty to keep the premises reasonably safe for Plaintiff.
- g. Whether as a proximate result of Defendant's negligence, and vicarious liability for its employees' negligent conduct as set forth herein, Plaintiff slipped and fell while a business invitee in the warehouse/retail store, which proximately caused Plaintiff to suffer injuries and damages.
 - h. Whether Plaintiff can recover money damages for reimbursement of her past

and future medical expenses, and past and future general damages for her pain, suffering, loss of enjoyment of life, and impairment to her activities of daily living.

Defendant:

- a. Whether Plaintiff can establish that Costco breached any duty owed to Plaintiff.
- b. Whether Plaintiff can establish the existence of a dangerous condition resulting from any act or omission on the part of Costco.
- c. Whether Plaintiff can establish that Costco had actual or constructive notice of a dangerous condition.
- d. Whether Plaintiff bears any contributory/comparative fault for the Incident and all damages allegedly arising therefrom.
- e. Whether Plaintiff can establish that her alleged injuries and other claimed damages resulted from the condition of which she complains.
 - f. Whether Plaintiff's medical treatment was reasonable and necessary.
 - g. Whether Plaintiff can establish her claimed special and general damages.

C. Jurisdiction

Plaintiff filed this action in the Superior Court of the State of Arizona. Defendant removed the action on the basis of diversity of citizenship as well as the amount in controversy exceeding \$75,000.00 under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332, 1441 and 1446. The Court determines diversity jurisdiction at the time of removal. As of the date this matter was removed, Plaintiff was a resident of Arizona and Costco was a citizen of Washington.

Venue in the District of Arizona is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 because Costco regularly transacts business within this District, is otherwise subject to personal jurisdiction in this District, and a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claims occurred in this District and Division.

D. <u>Service of Parties</u>

All parties have been served.

E. <u>Dispositive Issues</u>

None at this time.

F. **Status of Related Cases** 1 There are no related cases pending before other courts or other judges of this Court. 2 3 G. **Initial Disclosures** 4 The parties previously exchanged Initial Rule 26.1 Disclosure Statements while the 5 matter was in Superior Court. The parties will exchange Initial Disclosures that comply with Rule 26(a), Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, no later than September 22, 2023. H. 7 **Proposed Deadlines** 8 1. Deadline for amending the pleadings: September 22, 2023 9 2. Expert Discovery 10 a. Plaintiff's disclosure of expert testimony: October 27, 2023 11 b. Defendant's disclosure of expert testimony: December 22, 2023 12 c. Rebuttal expert testimony: January 26, 2024 13 d. Completion of expert depositions: March 22, 2024 14 3. Deadline for written discovery and fact witness depositions: **December 22, 2023** 15 4. Deadline to disclose ESI: **December 22, 2023** 16 5. Deadline to file dispositive motions: April 19, 2024 17 6. Deadline to conduct good faith settlement negotiations: January 26, 2024 18 I. **Estimated Trial Length** 19 The parties anticipate a four (4) day trial. 20 J. **Jury Trial** 21 Plaintiff has requested a jury trial. Costco does not contest. 22 K. **Prospects for Settlement** 23 The will parties have already begun and will continue to consider and discuss the 24 prospect for settlement. While the parties believe that this is a case that can and should be 25 settled informally, the parties may need to request the assistance of a Magistrate Judge in 26 facilitating a settlement conference at the end of fact discovery. 27 28

1	L.	Unusual, Difficult, or Complex Problems
2		None at this time.
3	М.	Other Matters
4		None at this time.
5		DATED this 29 th day of August, 2023.
6		
7		THE SCHMIDT LAW GROUP, P.C.
8		
9		By: <u>/s/ Eric W. Schmidt</u> ERIC W. SCHMIDT
10		Attorneys for Plaintiff
11		
12		
13		BREMER WHYTE BROWN & O'MEARA LLP
14		
15		By: /s/ Eric W. Schmidt (w/permission) JOHN J. BELANGER
16		RYAN S. LEIBEL Attorneys for Defendant
17		Attorneys for Defendant Costco Wholesale Corporation
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
		z –

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** I hereby certify that on August 29, 2023, I electronically transmitted the attached document to the Clerk's Office using the CM/ECF System for filing and transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing to the following CM/ECF Registrants, as well as e-mailed a copy as follows: 4 John J. Belanger, Esq. 5 jbelanger@bremerwhyte.com Ryan S. Leibel, Esq. rleibel@bremerwhyte.com BREMER WHYTE BROWN & O'MEARA LLP 8950 South 52nd Street, Suite 201 Tempe, AZ 85284 8 Telephone: (602) 274-1204 (602) 274-1205 Facsimile: Attorneys for Defendant, 10 Costco Wholesale Corporation 11 By: /s/ Sofia Di'Medici 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 6